



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,363	11/16/2001	Kenneth G. De Souza	9794.00	5597
26889	7590	10/10/2007		
MICHAEL CHAN NCR CORPORATION 1700 SOUTH PATTERSON BLVD DAYTON, OH 45479-0001			EXAMINER KESACK, DANIEL	
			ART UNIT 3691	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/10/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/992,363
Filing Date: November 16, 2001
Appellant(s): DE SOUZA ET AL.

MAILED

OCT 10 2007

GROUP 3600

Gregory A. Welte
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Art Unit: 3691

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 5/19/2006 in response to an Order Returning an Undocketed Appeal from the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences dated 3/7/2006. Note that the Examiner's Answer mailed on 12/29/2004 is vacated.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

US 2003/0078864 A1	Hardesty et al.	4-2003
6,513,015	Ogasawara	1-2003

5,903,880

Biffar

5-1999

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

A.) Claims 9, 10, 22, 23, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. US 2003/0078864 A1 (hereinafter "Hardesty").

Regarding claim 9, Hardesty discloses a method, comprising maintaining a score of bonus points for a customer (see paragraph 0007); detecting entry of the customer through a portal (consumers "visit" certain websites via a portal); and in response to the entry, increasing the score (see paragraph 0007); [claim 10] the step of detecting entry is accomplished with no social interaction with the customer (inherent because account identification is electronic); and [claim 28] wherein increasing the score is done without detecting a purchase by the customer (paragraph 0007 offers incentives for merely visiting/entering web sites).

Regarding claim 22, Hardesty discloses a system as set forth in claim 9. Claim 23 is similar to claim 10 and is rejected for the same reasons as described above in detail.

Art Unit: 3691

B.) Claims 1-8, 11, 13-21, 24, 26, and 29-31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,513,015 (hereinafter "Ogasawara") in view of Hardesty.

The Examiner notes that the final office action includes a typographical error regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claims 1-8, 11, 13-21, 24, 26, and 29-31. Hardesty was erroneously missing from the rejection statement. However, the body of the rejection clearly sets forth that Hardesty is the secondary reference. Additionally, paragraph 8 (p. 6) of the final office action refers to the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claims 1-8, 11, 13-21, 24, 26, and 29-31. On page 3 of the Appeal Brief, Appellant notes that the rejection statement in the final office is not complete. Appellant states that the rejection statement solely lists "Hardesty". As set forth above, the rejection statement mentioned "Ogasawara" but erroneously left out "Hardesty". Based on page 3 of the Appeal Brief, it appears that Appellant argues the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claims 1-8, 11, 13-21, 24, 26, and 29-31 as the rejection was intended by the Examiner.

Regarding claim 1, Ogasawara discloses a method, comprising at a portal to enclosure, receiving an identity signal from a transponder (see paragraph bridging columns 8-9); locating an account, based on the identity signal (see column 8, lines 4-16); creating a change in the account (see column 13, lines 38-55); [claim 2] the transponder is carried by a person (see Figure 1);[claim 3] the change in the account is beneficial to the person (see column 13, lines 38-55); [claim 4] the identity signal is invisible to third parties (inherent); and [claim 5] no social interaction with the person accompanies locating the account (inherent because account identification is electronic).

Regarding claim 6, Ogasawara discloses a method, comprising at a portal to an enclosure, receiving an identity signal from a transponder carried by a person (see paragraph bridging columns 8-9); and issuing an award to a party identified by the

identity signal (see column 13, lines 38-55); [claim 7] the party identified is identical to the person (inherent); and [claim 8] the award is accompanied by no social interaction with the person at the time the identity signal is received from the transponder (inherent because account identification is electronic).

Regarding claim 14, Ogasawara discloses a system as set forth in claim 1. Claims 15-18 are similar to claims 2-5 and are rejected for the same reasons as described above in detail.

Regarding claim 19, Ogasawara discloses a system as set forth in claim 6. Claims 20-21 are similar to claims 7-8 and are rejected for the same reasons as described above in detail.

Regarding claims 1, 6, 14, 19, and 31, Ogasawara fails to explicitly disclose creating a change in the account prior to any purchase by a party identified by the identity signal.

Hardesty teaches the use of creating a change in the account prior to any purchase by a party identified by the identity signal (paragraph 0007 notes that incentives are granted to users for merely *visiting* a website as compared to purchasing a product or service). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ogasawara with awarding incentives for merely entering the store as taught by Hardesty, because providing an incentive for a customer to merely "visit" or enter the store attracts customers to the store, wherein inherently increasing the likelihood that the person will make a purchase.

Art Unit: 3691

Regarding claims 11 and 13, Ogasawara fails to explicitly disclose transmitting a message to a location in response to the identify signal.

Hardesty teaches awarding an incentive in response to the identify signal of a user, when the user merely "visits" the retail store (in this case electronically, see paragraph 0007) and further teaches sending a message to the person and a third party which results in modification of a monetary account of the person (see paragraph 0046). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ogasawara with a response to the identify signal as taught by Hardesty, because providing an incentive for a customer to merely "visit" or enter the store attracts customers to the store, wherein inherently increasing the likelihood that the person will make a purchase.

Regarding claim 24, Ogasawara and Hardesty disclose a system as set forth in claim 11.

Claim 26 is similar to claim 13 and is rejected for the same reasons as described above in detail.

C.) Claims 12, 25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogasawara in view of Hardesty as applied to claims 1-8, 11, 13-21, 24, 26, and 29-31 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,903,880 (hereinafter "Biffar").

Regarding claim 12, Ogasawara in combination with Hardesty et al. show all the claimed elements as set forth above except for the use of the message comprises an e-mail message addressed to the person.

Biffar teaches the use of e-mailing incentive/loyal award information (see column 16, lines 49-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ogasawara with e-mail notification of loyalty information, because e-mailing account information will allow users to keep track of potential awards or incentives.

Regarding claim 25, Ogasawara, Hardesty et al., and Biffar disclose a system as set forth in claim 12.

Regarding claim 27, Ogasawara discloses using a non-contact detector to detect entry (as set forth above in detail).

D.) It is noted that the previous 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claims 9 and 10 is withdrawn.

(10) Response to Argument

It is noted that Appellant repeated various arguments throughout the Appeal Brief. The Examiner replied to each main argument at least once in this **Response to Argument** but merely noted all other redundant occurrences of the same or very similar arguments at the beginning of each response. In no way did the Examiner intend to neglect to respond to the additional recitations of similar arguments. It is the Examiner's

Art Unit: 3691

position that each and every point, problem, or sub-point argued by Appellant is clearly addressed by at least one response.

On page 10, under **Faulty Reference** (also argued under Problem 1), Appellant argues that Hardesty is not prior art. Appellant argues that Hardesty was “published” after the filing date of Appellant’s filing date. However, the Examiner notes that Hardesty’s filing date of 12/22/00 predates Appellant’s filing date of 11/16/01. Therefore, Hardesty is a valid reference and considered prior art.

On page 11, under Problem 1 (also argued on page 16, under Problem 3; page 18, under Problem 4; page 21, under Point 2; page 23, under Point 3; page 23, under Point 4; page 37, under Point 3), Appellant argues that the examiner’s definition of the term “portal” is a fanciful interpretation of term. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. In the art of electronic data processing, the term “portal” is defined as set forth above in section (10), paragraph (D):

A web site that serves as a gateway to the Internet; portal is a collection of links, content, and services designed to guide users to information they are likely to find interesting (*Microsoft Computer Dictionary*, 4th ed.).

Absent an express definition by in specification, the Examiner may read the claim limitations as broadly as reasonably possible. On page 7, first paragraph of the specification, Appellant provides examples of portals (i.e. a door) but failed to provide a clear definition. Since examples are not considered an express definition, the Examiner defined “portal” as broadly as reasonably possible. In addition, Appellant recites language in other independent claims (i.e., claims 1 and 6) that clearly identifies a portal

Art Unit: 3691

in the physical environment ("a portal to an enclosure"), as opposed to an electronic environment. It is the Examiner's position that Appellant had ample opportunity to present claim language (claims 9, 10, 22, 23, and 28) in such as a manner that unquestionably defined "portal" in a physical environment (i.e., a door, gate, window, etc.). Since Appellant insisted on broad claim language, the Examiner maintained a broad interpretation of the term "portal". Therefore, it is the Examiner's position that the term "portal" as interpreted in an Internet shopping environment, as opposed to a brick and mortar shopping environment, is not an improper interpretation of the term.

On page 11, under Problem 2 (also argued page 15, under Problem 2; page 23 under Point 1; page 27, under Claim 28; page 31, under Point 1; page 32, under Point 2; page 44, under Claim Elements not Shown in Prior Art), Appellant argues that Hardesty does not award loyalty points for visiting web sites. It is Appellant's position that loyalty points are awarded only for after making a purchase, which would be an incentive for a customer to revisit Internet store in the future. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Hardesty clearly sets forth in paragraph 0007 that loyalty points are awarded for either making a purchase or to "visit" web sites. Additionally, Hardesty notes in paragraphs 0030 and 0077 that users may be rewarded with non-spending activities (i.e., "directed web surfing", wherein web surfing includes visiting online stores). A complete and thorough reading of Hardesty leaves zero doubt that Hardesty grants reward benefits for merely visiting an online store as opposed to most other businesses that require a customer to make a purchase (see paragraphs 0007, 0030, and 0077).

On pages 11-12, under Problem 1 (also argued on page 40, under Problem 1; page 45, under No Teaching Given; page 46, under No Compliance with Dembiczak), Appellant argues that there is no motivation to combine the references. In response to appellant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the Examiner supplied ample motivation for combining Ogasawara and Hardesty in the final office action:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ogasawara with a response to the identify signal as taught by Hardesty, because providing an incentive for a customer to merely "visit" or enter the store attracts customers to the store, wherein inherently increasing the likelihood that the person will make a purchase (Final Office Action 5/3/04).

Appellant argues that the Examiner's motivation is merely an invocation of basic marketing principles. The Examiner agrees. It is noted that Ogasawara discloses awarding loyalty points to customers for making a purchase. Hardesty is merely relied upon to teach that it is old and well known to award loyalty points for simply visiting a store without necessarily making a purchase. Customer's are more likely to visit a store and potentially make a purchase if the customer is rewarded for visiting the store. Therefore, the Examiner's motivation is proper and would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 3691

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because the motivation is a "basic principle of marketing".

On page 12, under Problem 2, Appellant argues that "most claims" state that bonus points are awarded in absence of a transaction (or similar), which is directly contrary to both references. First, it is unclear what claims Appellant is arguing. Secondly, Hardesty discloses awarding bonus points for merely visiting a store (see Hardesty paragraphs 0007, 0030, and 0077 as set forth above in detail).

On page 13, under Problem 3 (also argued on page 43, under **Claim 14**; page 43, under **Claim 19**; page 43, under **Claim 22**; page 44, under **Claim 24**), Appellant argues that the rejection of claims 14-26 fails to provide corresponding structure to meet the "means-type" recitation. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As forth in the final office action (5/3/04) all limitations "means-type" limitations are clearly disclosed by Ogasawara. As an example, Ogasawara discloses means for detecting entry of a person through a portal (see Ogasawara, see paragraph bridging columns 8-9).

On page 20, under Problem 5, Appellant argues that a "web site" has no specific geographic locus. The claims fail to require a "specific geographic location". Appellant is arguing limitations not found in the claims. Therefore, Appellant's argument is moot.

On page 20, under Problem 6, Appellant argues that Hardesty use of the term "visit" is placed in quotes because it is a fanciful use of the term. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. In an electronic environment, the use of term visit as related to a web site is a valid and well established use of the term.

Art Unit: 3691

On page 21, under Additional Point 1, Appellant argues that patent claims must be given the broadest reasonable interpretation **consistent with the specification**. As set forth above, the specification failed to set forth an express definition for the term "portal". "Absent an express definition in their specification, the fact that appellants can point to definitions or usages that conform to their interpretation does not make the PTO's definition unreasonable when the PTO can point to other sources that support its interpretation." *In re Morris*, 127, F3.d at 1056, 44 USPQ2d at 1029. In this case the Examiner relies upon *Microsoft Computer Dictionary*, 4th ed., wherein a "portal" is a web site that serves as a gateway to the Internet; portal is a collection of links, content, and services designed to guide users to information they are likely to find interesting. Since the term "portal" (as defined above) places the claim 9 clearly within the technological arts, the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection is withdrawn.

On page 21, under Additional Point 2, Appellant argues that visiting a web site does not anticipate the claims. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As set forth above, the Examiner is reading the claims as broadly as reasonably possible. As set forth above, Hardesty anticipates claims 9, 10, 22, 23, and 28.

On page 22, under Additional Point 3, Appellant acknowledges that the term "portal" has an additional definition that means "an entry point into a computer network." As set forth above, the specification failed to set forth an express definition for the term "portal".

On page 22, under Additional Point 4 (also argue on page 32, under Point 4), Appellant argues that a website does not identify a person when the person visits the

web site, except when persons identify themselves to the web site. It is the Examiner's position that when a person enrolls in the loyalty program of Hardesty, they are identifying themselves to the website. Therefore, Hardesty discloses identifying a person entering the online store through the web portal based on a persons loyalty program enrollment information.

On page 27, under Claim 22 (also argued on page 36, under **Claim 24**), Appellant argues that apparatus claim 22 is considered separately patentable from method claim 9 as PTO's restriction attests. It is noted that claims 9 and 22 were not restricted. Claims 9 and 22 are neither independent nor distinct in terms of restriction practice (same for claims 11 and 24).

On page 29, third paragraph, Appellant notes that Ogasawara does not alter the demographic profile, or add bonus points, when a customer is detected as entering the retail store. The Examiner agrees. However, Hardesty, not Ogasawara, is relied upon to teach altering the demographic profile, or add bonus points, when a customer is detected as entering a store.

On page 33, under Point 3 (also argued on page 34, under Sub-Point 3A; page 34, under Sub-Point 3B), Appellant argues that PTO must show a reasonable expectation of success. The Examiner agrees. Regarding 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections, Ogasawara discloses detecting and identifying a person entering a store (see paragraph bridging columns 8-9). Additionally, Ogasawara discloses awarding loyalty points for a user's specific activity (in this case Ogasawara awards points for making purchases; see column 13, lines 38-55). Hardesty teaches awarding loyalty points for

Art Unit: 3691

two specific user activities: making a purchase or visiting an online store (see paragraph 0007; see also paragraphs 0030 and 0077). Therefore, there is a reasonable expectation of success for Hardesty to teach Ogasawara the feature of awarding points to persons visiting a store (online or offline stores).

On page 35, under Point 1 (also argued on page 41, under Problem 2; page 41, under **Claim 24**), Appellant argues that the Examiner failed to establish *prima facie* case of obviousness because the Examiner did point to specific citations in the references for claims 11 and 13. Appellant's argument is noted but has little merit considering that all limitations of claims 11 and 13 were addressed in the same section but for different claims with similar limitations. For example, the Examiner detailed all features of claims 1-8 (see final office action, 5/3/04). For the sake of efficiency, the Examiner did not find it necessary to be redundant in the detailed explanation of the prior art references. All limitations of claims 11 and 13 are taught by Ogasawara and Hardesty as set forth in section 7 of the final office action (5/3/04).

On page 36, under Point 2 (also argued on page 42, under Problem 2; page 42, under **Claim 24**), Appellant requests clarification of where the prior art references a "transponder associated with a person", "identity signal", "portal", and an "enclosure". As set forth in the previous paragraph, the Examiner did not find it necessary to repeat limitations explained in detail for similar claims 1 and 6. Ogasawa discloses a transponder (11), an identity signal (via sensor processor 18), a portal (see Figure 1) and an enclosure (see paragraph bridging columns 8-9, line 56, "establishment"). Additionally, on page 31, Appellant notes that in Appellant's previous amendment

Art Unit: 3691

(1/6/04), Appellant requested clarification of where Hardesty recites a transponder. As set forth in the final office action (5/3/04) mailed in response to Appellant's previous amendment (1/6/04), the Examiner relies upon Ogasawara, not Hardesty to disclose a transponder (see final Office Action, section 7, 5/3/04).

On page 38, under Point 5 (also argued on page 39, under Point 6; page 39, under Point 7), Appellant argues that paragraph 0046 of Hardesty fails to teach the features of claim 11 (part b). In addition to paragraph 0046, Hardesty teaches transmitting a message to a location which is accessible by the person in response to the identify signal (see paragraph 0037 and 0038 that discuss transmitting a message concerning changes in user account based upon the identify signal).

On page 47, Appellant argues that no valid teaching has been given for combining Ogasawara, Hardesty, and Biffar. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As set forth in the final office action on 5/3/04 the following motivation was submitted:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ogasawara with e-mail notification of loyalty information, because e-mailing account information will allow users to keep track of potential awards or incentives.

The motivation set forth above is proper because it provides a valid reason for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the features of Biffar with the combination of Ogasawara/Hardesty. However, after a more detailed review of Hardesty, it is believed that Hardesty also teaches the features relied upon by Biffar (i.e., e-mailing incentive or loyalty point information; see Hardesty paragraphs 0037 and 0038).

Art Unit: 3691

Appellant's arguments related the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection are noted and the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections are withdrawn.

On page 49, under Point 2, Appellant argues that Hardesty has been "issued" and should have been objected to like Appellant's claims related to 35 U.S.C. § 101. Appellant is reminded that Hardesty is a published patent application, not an issued patent.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Art Unit: 3691

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel Kesack

Art Unit 3691

Handwritten signature of Daniel Kesack in black ink.

Conferees:

Vincent Millin

Appeal Conference Specialist

TC 3600

Alexander Kalinowski

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Art Unit 3691

Handwritten signature of Alexander Kalinowski in black ink.